

RUHN-00-3

EXACT CHIRAL SYMMETRY WITH A NON-PERTURBATIVE CUTOFF. ^a

H. Neuberger

*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Rutgers University, Piscataway,
NJ 08855, USA**E-mail: neuberger@physics.rutgers.edu*

The main ideas behind the new ways to preserve chiral symmetries for lattice fermions are presented. The discussion is focused on vector-like fermions, the case relevant for lattice QCD.

Chiral effective Lagrangian techniques provide a succinct and reasonably accurate description of low energy QCD¹. This description is possible because it only reflects the approximate chiral symmetries of QCD. Taking the number of light quarks as three there is an approximate global $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$ symmetry. The symmetry is broken explicitly, but weakly, by the quark masses. There is no global $U(1)_L \times U(1)_R$ because it is explicitly, but strongly, broken by instantons. Only one abelian global symmetry remains, a vectorial $U(1)_V$.

The left and right (L, R) components of the symmetry group are best understood by thinking about Weyl fermions as the fundamental building blocks of matter, rather than Dirac fermions. One Dirac fermion is made up of one left and one right handed Weyl fermion. While a mass term couples the two fields directly, the interaction with gluons does not, because gluons carry spin one. In four dimensions anything but a bilinear fermion interaction is strongly suppressed by a much higher energy scale. Ignoring weak interactions we conclude that in the absence of mass terms, independent global rotations between different flavors of the right and left Weyl quark fields leave the Lagrangian invariant.

Many theories that differ in the ultraviolet, but with the same structure of global symmetries will be described by structurally identical effective Lagrangians in the infrared, only the numerical values of the parameters would differ. In particular, this class ought to include, to leading order at low energy, also lattice regularizations of QCD, provided only they keep the symmetry structure intact. The lattice case is somewhat special because the lattice

^aInvited talk at the international conference “Quark Confinement and the Hadron Spectrum IV”, July 3 - July 8, Vienna, Austria.

breaks Euclidean Lorentz invariance: as a result, at orders higher than leading order in the low energy expansion, there will be differences between the effective Lagrangian applicable to the lattice and the one applicable to QCD². (Also, in practical simulations, Euclidean Lorentz invariance is broken by the toroidal boundary conditions one typically uses in a lattice simulation. These breakings also do not affect the leading order term.)

The effective Lagrangian framework involves, in a direct manner, such fundamental QCD quantities as the pion and kaon decay constants and the various current quark masses. This is very well known in the continuum. The same story holds also on the lattice, and, in principle, the above quantities would play a central role in the lattice effective Lagrangian. The point I wish to stress is that this should happen even relatively far from the continuum limit: Using the leading order effective lattice Lagrangian on the lattice, before the continuum limit is taken, there are natural definitions of decay constants and quark masses. This is not how these quantities are extracted by conventional lattice methods, because these methods break explicitly chiral symmetry and restore it only in the continuum limit. There are then no natural effective Lagrangian definitions of these quantities before the continuum limit is taken.

Based on the experience³ with the lattice realization of the (potentially strongly interacting) Higgs sector one expects significant advantages for the numerical extraction of these parameters (in particular the pion decay constant) when an effective Lagrangian description is applicable directly on the lattice.

So, one would like the global symmetry features of QCD to be incorporated into any non-perturbative approach, but from 1973-1992 it was thought that lattice regularization was not intelligent enough to do that and there was no escape from having to first go close to the continuum limit before chiral symmetry became approximately correct. One could not assure exact masslessness of quarks on the lattice so one could never see the spontaneous symmetry breakdown effects (like, for example, masslessness of pions for zero mass up and down quarks) in isolation from the explicit breaking effects induced by the small, but nonzero true quark masses. The entire concept of small quark masses in which one can perturb would not apply to the lattice without also requiring closeness to the continuum limit.

The main reason for the failure of the lattice to preserve chiral symmetries is that the lattice does too perfect a job of preserving the continuum principle of minimal substitution ($p \rightarrow p_\mu + eA_\mu$ and its non-abelian generalization). This property of the lattice regularization implies that any exact global symmetry can be “gauged” turning it into an exact local gauge invariance. Local gauge invariance means that the theory depends on fewer degrees of freedom than

must be used to express the action in a form that employs a local Lagrangian. But, the well known inevitability of anomalies⁴ tells us that when one tries to gauge certain kinds of chiral symmetries the extra degrees of freedom do not totally and exactly decouple; a certain class of actions (the Wess-Zumino actions) cannot be eliminated by local redefinitions, and keep these degrees of freedom coupled to the rest. To avoid a paradox it must be then that it is impossible to explicitly preserve certain chiral global symmetries (including those we need for QCD) even only globally. Indeed when one tries to include such “forbidden” global chiral symmetries one encounters all kinds of difficulties. While the difficulties may take different forms, the fundamental reason for their appearance is the existence of irremovable Wess-Zumino actions in the continuum. In this sense, the difficulties themselves can be viewed as universal. The decade between 1985 and 1995 saw a substantial, albeit rather misguided, activity in trying to devise ways around these obstacles. These efforts amounted to an industry of failures which made many workers in the field give up on the problem and become very skeptical about the prospects of achieving exact chiral symmetry on the lattice. Thus, although the essence of a solution was available already in 1993, it took six years more for a substantial fraction of the lattice community to finally accept it.

The main catalyst for the new development were two totally independent papers, published during the same year, one by Frolov and Slavnov⁵ and the other by Kaplan⁶. Narayanan and I⁷ synthesized the main ideas of these papers into what became later to be known as the “overlap”. The basic idea can be loosely phrased as hiding a Weyl fermion among an infinite number of Dirac fermions. If we think about the Dirac fermions as pairs of Weyl fermions we have an infinite number of left Weyl fermions and an infinite number of right Weyl fermions. If the two infinities are equal to each other the theory is vector like, but if they differ by one we have an extra Weyl fermion. If indeed there is this mismatch, any fermion number conserving mass matrix we would introduce would be able to lift the masses only of Dirac Weyl-pairs, leaving one unpaired zero mass Weyl fermion.

To make this more concrete, consider the fermionic part of a multi-flavor generalization of QCD,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{\text{fermion}} &= \bar{\psi} \not{D}(A) \psi + \bar{\psi} \frac{1+\gamma_5}{2} M \psi + \bar{\psi} \frac{1-\gamma_5}{2} M^\dagger \psi \\ &= \bar{\psi} \not{D}(A) \psi + \bar{\psi}_R M \psi_L + \bar{\psi}_L M^\dagger \psi_R\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

and assume the mass matrix M is infinite. How many fermions are determined by the operator M . (The proper generalization of the concept of a finite matrix to the infinite situation is to introduce some Hilbert space in which M acts as an operator.) While saying how many flavors we have is meaning-

less, the difference between the number of right handed and left handed Weyl fermions is dynamically fixed by the structure of M , so long the kernels of M and $M^\dagger$ are finite dimensional, a very common case in physics applications. The difference between the dimensions of the two kernels is invariant under suitably limited variations of the mass operator; it is an “index”. The index cannot change in perturbation theory, so, if we arranged to have a surplus of one right handed Weyl fermion by picking a certain structure for M , this massless degree of freedom will not disappear under radiative corrections coming from the interaction with gluons. Since the Weyl degree of freedom is unpaired one cannot generate a mass term for it. Since the total number of fermions is infinite, there is some uncertainty about how accurately the Lagrangian defines the system. Thus, one can expect to have exact global chiral symmetries, and postpone the expected obstacles to the point when one must give a precise meaning to the infinite number of flavors.

The simplest explicit realization of a mass matrix with unit index is by domain wall fermions. The Hilbert space is taken as the space of square integrable functions on the real line. It is possible to replace the infinite real line by an infinite one dimensional lattice, but this is a technicality, and probably not a very useful one. A simple choice for M is:

$$M = -\partial_s + \Lambda \operatorname{sign}(s), \quad s \in (-\infty, +\infty). \quad (2)$$

It has an index because

$$M\psi = 0 \Rightarrow \psi = \psi_0 \propto e^{-\Lambda|s|}, \quad (3)$$

which is normalizable, but

$$M^\dagger\psi = 0 \Rightarrow \psi \propto e^{\Lambda|s|}, \quad (4)$$

which is not.

Also, excepting ψ_0 , all eigenstates of $M^\dagger M$ are paired with those of $MM^\dagger$ and have energies of order Λ . We now view Λ as an additional ultraviolet cutoff in our theory, and the entire infinite set of massive Dirac fermions have masses of the order of this additional ultraviolet cutoff. There is a finite and large spectral gap at zero. This arrangement is stable under perturbations of the mass matrix M by finite norm operators because the perturbation must cause shifts of order Λ before it can move the zero energy state away from zero. The main point is that it is the operator M that gets perturbed, so the perturbation of the operator $M^\dagger M$ is of a special type.

The system can be viewed as living in five (three) dimensions when only four (two) are physical and the extra dimension is seen only by the fermions.

$$\bar{\psi}_R M \psi_L + \bar{\psi}_L M^\dagger \psi_R = \bar{\psi} [\gamma_5 \partial_s + \Lambda \operatorname{sign}(s)] \psi \quad (5)$$

The gauge vector potentials do not see the extra dimension: there is no A_5 (A_3) and all A_μ are s -independent. Thus, the gauge fields act as the zero mode of the gauge field in KK dimensional reduction.

The main advantage of this choice is that one can easily interpret the fermion integral if one views the new line variable s as an Euclidean time, sort of a fifth dimension only the fermions are aware of. For a fixed gauge background the fermionic path integral one needs to give a precise meaning to has the action

$$S_\psi = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} ds \left[\int_x L_\psi \right] \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_\psi = \begin{cases} \bar{\psi} \gamma_5 [\partial_s + H(-\Lambda, A)] \psi & \text{if } s < 0 \\ \bar{\psi} \gamma_5 [\partial_s + H(+\Lambda, A)] \psi & \text{if } s > 0 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The obvious formal interpretation is

$$\int d\bar{\psi} d\psi e^{S_\psi} = \langle -\Lambda, A | \Lambda, A \rangle e^{-\infty [E_+(A) + E_-(A)]}. \quad (8)$$

$|\pm\Lambda, A\rangle$ are Fock states made out by filling all states in the Dirac seas associated with the single particle Hamiltonians $H(\pm\Lambda, A)$. The last factor is infinite, but gauge invariant. It arose from integrating out an infinite number of massive Dirac fermions. Therefore it is natural to discard it, as it should not have any effect on the continuum limit. Then one obtains a simple formula for the induced effective action, the “fermion determinant”. This is the overlap:

$$\langle -\Lambda, A | \Lambda, A \rangle, \quad (9)$$

where the states $|\pm\Lambda, A\rangle$ are Fock ground states of two systems of noninteracting fermions, with single particle hermitian Hamiltonians $H(\pm\Lambda, A) = \gamma_5 [\not{D}(A) \pm \Lambda]$.

The two ground states are for two completely regulated systems of noninteracting fermions moving in an arbitrary gauge field background. Thus, to calculate the overlap one simply needs to diagonalize two finite and explicitly known matrices. These matrices depend on the gauge background and transform by conjugation when the background changes by a gauge transformation. Therefore the eigenvalues are gauge invariant and the eigenspaces transform covariantly. The gauge fields can be viewed as external parameters the two matrices depend on. The gauge field background consists of a collection of all link matrices on a finite lattice, with toroidal boundary conditions.

Although the matrices are well defined, the bra and ket representing the ground states have a phase arbitrariness. Recall that we are still focusing on one multiplet of right handed (say) Weyl fermions. Thus, an ambiguity

is necessary to permit anomalies to enter. Without the ambiguity, complete finiteness and gauge covariance of expressions leading to a chiral fermion determinant would have been impossible. The proper mathematical description of the overlap is not that of a function over the space of gauge fields, but as a line bundle over the space of gauge orbits. This requires some more discussion, and some aspects relevant to QCD will be covered later on. In the chiral case one needs to pick some section through the line bundle built out of combining all individual multiplets. The mathematics is somewhat involved, but the bottom line is that one ends up ⁸ being able to reproduce on the lattice such subtle physical phenomena as, for example, composite massless fermions needed in order to comply with 't Hooft's consistency conditions.

In the vector-like case, relevant to QCD, we have two bundles, one associated to the left handed Weyl fermions and another to the matched right handed Weyl fermions. Although the individual sections are hard to choose, it is easy to see that any one choice for one handedness has a matching choice for the other. Thus, the combined bundle is trivial, and there is no ambiguity. The combined contribution of the left and right handed Weyl fermions is given by a function over the space of gauge orbits. The Dirac fermion determinant is given by a positive quantity:

$$\langle -\Lambda, A | + \Lambda, A \rangle \langle +\Lambda, A | - \Lambda, A \rangle = |\langle -\Lambda, A | + \Lambda, A \rangle|^2. \quad (10)$$

So long we do not try to factorize the expression on the RHS back into two the two complex conjugate factors on the LHS, one for each handedness, there is no ambiguity. But, the mere possibility to factorize the determinant means that global chiral symmetries are still present in some sense although these symmetries are not realized in a totally obvious way. One way to make it explicit how the global chiral symmetries got hidden is to first simplify the expression for the vector-like chiral determinant on the RHS.

This is relatively easy, once one observes that the two Fock ground state rays are completely defined (in the absence of accidental degeneracies - see below) if we know only the linear subspaces of the individual single particle systems that correspond to negative energies. In other words, we do not need to choose individually exact eigenstates of $H(\pm\Lambda, A)$ corresponding to each negative eigenvalue: we only need to define the subspace spanned by all eigenstates corresponding to negative eigenvalues. Any orthonormal basis in this subspace can be used to construct the Fock ground state, not just the one made out of single particle eigenstates. Thus, there must exist a way of expressing the Dirac fermion determinant in terms of the two projectors onto these subspaces.

In the concrete case of the single particle fermion lattice dynamics being

governed by the Wilson Dirac operator, one easily can prove that nothing is lost by making one of the subspaces, and the projector on it, trivial and gauge field independent. For the other subspace the dependence on gauge field is crucial and nontrivial. Linearly related to the projector is the sign function of the appropriate single particle Hamiltonian matrix. The sign functions of $H(\pm\Lambda, A)$ play a central role in the overlap Dirac operator to be introduced below. When the simplifying case of replacing $H(+\Lambda, A)$ by $H(+\infty, A)$ is chosen, as mentioned above, $\text{sign}(H(\Lambda, A))$ becomes trivial, being given by γ_5 . The basic identity⁹ that applies in this case is

$$|\langle\infty| - \Lambda, A\rangle|^2 = \det D_o, \quad (11)$$

where,

$$D_o = \frac{1 + \gamma_5 \text{sign } H_W(m, U)}{2}. \quad (12)$$

Here, I reverted to more standard notation for H , using m instead of $-\Lambda$, and the link variable symbol U , instead of A . The subscript indicates that we use Wilson's form. The parameter m is somewhere between 0 and -2 , but neither 0 nor -2 . Theoretically, the simplest case to analyze is $m = -1$.

Had we not introduced the one (merely technical) simplification for one of the subspaces we would have made no commitment to the kind of regularization we are using. To be concrete however, we need to go sooner or later to the lattice. Here we face the well known problem of nontrivial topological sectors.

For a while, after the spectacular emergence of "instanton" physics, it was believed that there was no clean way in which the space of lattice gauge field configurations can reproduce the property of the same space in the continuum, namely that it is disconnected into sectors uniquely identified by one signed integer. Indeed, the space of lattice configuration is just a finite product of group factors and hence glaringly connected. But, as first shown by Phillips and Stone¹⁰, following some work by Lüscher, one can slice up the lattice based space by removing subsets of zero measure (relative to the natural measure of a product of one factor of Haar measures per link, times any positive smooth functional of the gauge fields) and this division approximates the continuum situation in a sense that can be made precise. On any finite lattice, the range of topological numbers that can be accurately represented is limited to a finite segment, as expected. While the details of the slicing-up are not universal, all such divisions will agree in terms of the topological number of a gauge background that is, in some precise sense, smooth enough. The smoothness criterion is gauge invariant: any two backgrounds related by a lattice gauge transformation are regarded as having the same amount of smoothness.

When massless fermions are present, the behavior in each topological sector is characterized by a different multilinear object of fermion fields that acquires a non-zero expectation value upon fermion integration. This object is gauge invariant, and $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R \times U(1)_V$ invariant. At zero topological charge the object is unity, but at nonzero topological charge it is non-trivial and its non-zero expectation value (after averaging over gauge backgrounds) breaks $U(1)_A$. Since the behavior in the different sectors is so distinct, when lattice gauge fields are smoothly deformed from one sector into another, something singular must happen somewhere along the way. What happens is that the sign function becomes ill defined. It is ill defined for gauge field backgrounds where the many-body ground state is degenerate. This happens precisely where the single particle Hamiltonian matrix has an exact zero eigenvalue. Clearly, this happens only on a subset of gauge fields of zero measure. Moreover, since the eigenvalues are gauge invariant, the criterion is gauge invariant. The sign function is defined only for gauge backgrounds for which there are no zero modes to the single particle Hamiltonian. Thus, the space of gauge orbits is partitioned, just like in the Phillips and Stone scenario.

The division of the space of gauge orbits is done by using fermions. In this sense, the overlap provides, as a side result, a “fermionic Phillips and Stone construction” of topology on the lattice. The fermionic character of this construction makes it trivial to go beyond Phillips and Stone, towards a lattice version of the Atiyah-Singer theorem itself. It becomes almost tautological: Since we defined lattice gauge field topology by the fermions the relation to fermions is built in. To be sure, complete contact with continuum is made only after one makes it precise what the requirements of the lattice one needs to use for a given continuum configuration are, in order to ensure that the fermionic topological number given by the overlap coincides with the topological number of the continuum gauge field configuration. If we just move one important step beyond the Atiyah-Singer theorem to include the essential physics, nothing is even remotely tautological any more. Just like ’t Hooft showed in the continuum, the nontrivial topology of the gauge background implies explicit $U(1)_A$ breaking by expectation values of “ ’t Hooft vertices”, on the lattice too we see that in nontrivial sectors we have non-zero ’t Hooft vertices. This is the main physics application of the Atiyah-Singer theorem, and this is what really matters in QCD. It is this feature that one needs to reproduce on the lattice if the latter is to solve the “ $U(1)_A$ problem” in the way discovered by ’t Hooft. To summarize, the overlap produces a good definition of topological charge, via the formula:

$$Q_{\text{top}}(U) = -\frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [\text{sign}(H_W(m, U))] \quad (13)$$

The trace operation involves a sum over sites and over spinorial and color indices. The sum over the sites is over a local quantity, a lattice version of the continuum topological density. This can be shown to hold using perturbation theory or more sophisticated means, so long the lattice is fine enough in some precise sense. When $Q_{\text{top}}(U)$ is non-zero the number of negative energy states of $H_W(m, U)$ differs from one half the total number of states. As a result the fermionic determinant is trivially zero, since by our identity $\det D_o$ is given by the overlap of two orthogonal states. Moreover, we know how many creation operators need to be inserted between the two states making up the overlap to make it non-vanishing. These operator insertions naturally correspond to individual Grassmann factors making up 't Hooft's vertex. From the point of view of the conserved fermion number operator in the auxiliary Quantum Mechanical problem producing the overlap we need an insertion that carries a specific fermion number in one factor of the overlap and minus that fermion number in the other factor. Thus $U(1)_V$ is conserved but $U(1)_A$ is not, because it measures the difference between the fermion numbers in the two factors.

Having discussed how the one unwanted chiral symmetry is avoided by the lattice, it remains to be seen, explicitly, how the remaining global chiral symmetries are preserved by the lattice. In other words, we wish to see where chiral invariance is hidden in the action

$$\mathcal{L}_{\psi, V} = \bar{\psi} D_o \psi \equiv \bar{\psi} \frac{1+V}{2} \psi, \quad (14)$$

where $V = \gamma_5 \epsilon \equiv \gamma_5 \text{sign}(H_W(m, U))$ is unitary and obviously obeys

$$\gamma_5 V \gamma_5 = V^\dagger = V^{-1}. \quad (15)$$

D_o was obtained integrating out heavy degrees of freedom from a somewhat formally defined, but explicitly chiral (chiral because there was no direct coupling between the left and right Weyl components of the Dirac fermion), system. This is very similar to the approach of Ginsparg and Wilson¹¹ with the single conceptual difference that the heavy fermions integrated out by Ginsparg and Wilson corresponded to the high momentum modes of a continuous Dirac field. But, in both cases, on the way to a concrete action one hides chirality. The remnant is reflected by the “ γ_5 -hermiticity” of the unitary matrix V which defines D_o . This property of V is essentially equivalent to the Ginsparg-Wilson relation.

The fermionic propagator on internal fermion lines must generate the determinant, so has to be

$$G = \frac{2}{1+V} \quad (16)$$

A simple calculation now shows that

$$\gamma_5 G \gamma_5 = 2 - G, \quad (17)$$

implying that

$$G_\chi \equiv G - 1 = \frac{1 - V}{1 + V} = -\gamma_5 G_\chi \gamma_5 \quad (18)$$

and hence G_χ anticommutes with γ_5 . In a pure gauge background the propagator G_χ vanishes at the locations of the doublers ($V = 1$) and has the expected pole at zero momentum ($V = -1$). Thus, the free action G_χ^{-1} (with $U \equiv 1$) has poles at the doublers, just as suggested years ago by Rebbi¹². It is a nonlocal operator, but it is chiral. One cannot use $\det[G_\chi^{-1}]$ (for arbitrary U) as the fermion determinant, as shown by Pelissetto: the poles at the doublers represent non-local couplings that have measurable effects in the continuum limit¹³. So, G_χ is inadequate as a propagator on internal fermion lines and one must use G which has only the physical pole and no zeros. However, G_χ is perfectly adequate on external fermion lines, where it would provide the needed chiral identities relating various fermionic correlators in a fixed gauge background. But, is it consistent to have different propagators on internal and external fermions lines ? The answer is positive, as is easily seen by introducing an auxiliary fermionic variable ξ . ξ has a gauge invariant action (ξ transforms the same way as ψ) designed to make no contribution to the fermion determinant but subtract the identity from the propagator of ψ , G :

$$\mathcal{L}_\xi = -\bar{\xi}\xi. \quad (19)$$

We now declare that the “physical” fermionic fields $\bar{\psi}_{\text{ph}}, \psi_{\text{ph}}$ are given by:

$$\psi_{\text{ph}} = \psi + \xi, \quad \bar{\psi}_{\text{ph}} = \bar{\psi} + \bar{\xi}. \quad (20)$$

Clearly, the propagator $\langle \psi_{\text{ph}} \bar{\psi}_{\text{ph}} \rangle$ is G_χ , which is chiral. So, we use only ψ_{ph} fields when we construct quark operators whose matrix elements we wish to evaluate and these operators obey all chiral identities we know from the continuum.

Time has come to get more technical. One may wonder whether it would be possible to change the measure of integration over the link variables in such a manner that the space of accessible gauge field configurations would fall into topological sectors in just the way needed for $H_W(m, U)$ to never have zero eigenvalues. The answer is positive, because of the following rigorous inequality¹⁴:

$$[\lambda_{\min}(H_W^2(m, U))]^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \left[1 - (2 + \sqrt{2}) \sum_{\mu > \nu} \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} - |1 + m| \quad (21)$$

where

$$||1 - U_{\mu\nu}(x)|| \leq \epsilon_{\mu\nu}. \quad (22)$$

Here $U_{\mu\nu}(x)$ is the parallel transporter round one elementary plaquette, with a corner at site x and extending into the positive μ and ν directions. We could write a local gauge action that puts zero probability on any gauge field configuration that has any plaquette farther in norm from unity than a given (small) amount and thus assure that no gauge configuration that could produce a zero eigenvalue to $H_W(m, U)$ is allowed. This way we are cutting out a very large piece of the total space of gauge fields, much more than is really needed. But, the point of principle, albeit of rather academic interest, is that the criterion is enforceable by an acceptable local gauge action.

What really is of practical relevance is how one should simulate the rather nontrivial sign function of the hermitian Wilson Dirac operator¹⁵. There is no space here for a detailed review. In a nutshell the situation is as follows: There are two somewhat distinct ways to create a good numerical approximation of a system containing an exactly massless quark. In the first way, which goes under the name of “domain wall fermions”, one uses a discrete “fifth dimension” s , and keeps it of finite extent. This yields a system containing many heavy fermions, and one very light fermion. It turns out that numerically one needs to go to large extents in s in order to make the approximation work. The other way goes under the name of “overlap fermions” and is based on direct truncations of integral representations of the sign function. Both ways encounter numerical difficulties when the spectrum of $H_W(m, U)$ gets too close to zero, because the sign function has to jump by a finite amount when the sign of an eigenvalue switches. While differences of the order of a factor of 2 or 3 cannot be ruled out, the bottom line conclusion, based on several recent efforts, is that numerically the two methods are similar in cost.

There is little doubt that overlap fermions are theoretically cleaner, and therefore more adapted to analytical calculations, something that is always needed when contact with continuum is sought after. Therefore, barring some unforeseen numerical development, I expect domain wall fermions to be replaced by overlap fermions in QCD simulations that use the new advances on realizing chiral symmetry on the lattice. However, a large amount of computational resources, by today’s standards, has already been invested into domain wall fermions (with results of a somewhat mixed quality), and judging by the history of the entire subfield of lattice chiral fermions, although we already know now that overlap fermions would be better, it might take quite a few more years for the switch to overlap fermions to occur on a large scale.

Let me end on a more positive note: Unlike in many cases in theoretical Physics, when hard problems often get redefined and shifted around, the

problem of lattice chirality has been truly solved. Eventually, as a result of this, lattice field theory will change substantially and become more effective for QCD. Moreover, lattice field theory might be able to tackle chiral gauge theories and provide some reliable non-perturbative information on this extremely important class of field theories. I even believe that these developments will influence particle Physics as a whole, because the difficulty to naturally produce a low energy chiral gauge theory, without starting from one at higher energies, transcends the lattice in its relevance.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported in part by the DOE under grant # DE-FG05-96ER40559. I wish to thank the organizers of Confinement IV for the invitation to participate, for support, and for the hospitality extended.

References

1. “Dynamics of the Standard Model”, J. F. Donoghue, E. Golowich, B. R. Holstein, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
2. S. Myint, C. Rebbi, *Nucl. Phys. B* **421**, 241 (1994).
3. H. Neuberger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 889 (1988);
U. Heller, M. Klomfass, H. Neuberger, P. Vranas, *Nucl. Phys. B* **405**, 555 (1993);
G. Bhanot, K. Bitar, U. Heller, H. Neuberger, *Nucl. Phys. B* **353**, 551 (1991).
4. L. Alvarez-Gaume, “An introduction to anomalies” Erice School Math. Phys. 1985:0093(QCD161:I569:1985).
5. S. A. Frolov, A. A. Slavnov, *Phys. Lett. B* **303**, 344 (1993).
6. D. Kaplan, *Phys. Lett. B* **288**, 342 (1992).
7. R. Narayanan, H. Neuberger, *Phys. Lett. B* **302**, 62 (1993); *Nucl. Phys. B* **412**, 574 (1991); *Nucl. Phys. B* **443**, 305 (1995); *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 3251 (1993).
8. R. Narayanan, H. Neuberger, *Phys. Lett. B* **402**, 320 (1997).
9. H. Neuberger, *Phys. Lett. B* **417**, 141 (1998); *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 5417 (1998).
10. A. Phillips, D. Stone, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **103**, 699 (1986).
11. P. Ginsparg, K. Wilson, *Phys. Rev. D* **25**, 2649 (1982).
12. C. Rebbi, *Phys. Lett. B* **186**, 200 (1987).
13. A. Pelissetto, *Nucl. Phys. B* **4**, 515 (1988)(Porc. Suppl.).
14. H. Neuberger, *Phys. Rev. D* **61**, 85015 (2000).
15. H. Neuberger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 4060 (1998).